

1 MELINDA HAAG (CASBN 132612)
United States Attorney

2 MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 MICHAEL H. LAMPHIER (AZBN 21535)
5 Special Assistant United States Attorney

6 Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
7 Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-6394
8 Email: michael.lamphier@us.army.mil

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED

APR 16 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SALINAS DIVISION

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-12-00166 HRL
14 Plaintiff,)	
15 vs.)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
16 MARIA D. ORTEGA SANCHEEZ,)	
17 Defendant.)	
18)	

19 On April 2, 2012, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for an initial appearance.
20 The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from April 2, 2012, until June 4, 2012 at
21 9:30 a.m., in order to allow counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation. In
22 addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from April 2,
23 2012 to 4 June, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is
24 appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

2
3
4 DATED: 12 April 2012

/S/
MICHAEL H. LAMPHIER
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5
6
7 DATED:

/S/
MANUEL ARAUJO
Counsel for the Defendant

8
9
10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from April 2, 2012 to June 4, 2012. The Court finds, based on the
13 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance
14 and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to
15 grant the requested continuance would deny the parties reasonable time necessary for effective
16 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage
17 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18
18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20
21 DATED: 4/16/12


HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge